DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 778 EC 301 708

AUTHOR Davis, Sharon
TITLE Report Card to the Nation on Inclusion in Education of Students with Mental Retardation.
INSTITUTION Arc, Arlington, TX.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 39p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Arc, 500 E. Border St., Suite 300, Arlington, TX 76010 ($2).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Court Litigation; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Mainstreaming; *Mental Retardation; Resource Room Programs; Special Classes; Special Schools; State Programs; Statistical Data; *Student Placement; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Arc (Association for Retarded Citizens)

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a summary of the current status of efforts to include students with mental retardation in mainstream educational programs. It begins with a summary of a New Jersey federal court's ruling requiring more inclusive education and a discussion of the commitment of the Arc (formerly The Association for Retarded Citizens of the United States) to greater inclusion. The benefits of inclusive education for students with and without disabilities are briefly reviewed. Summary data (for 1989-90) are then given on placements nationally in eight different instructional arrangements. The next sections provide national and individual state data on the extent to which children with mental retardation are being educated in the following instructional settings: regular classes, resource rooms, separate classrooms, and separate schools. A summary points out that only 6.7 percent of children with mental retardation are being educated in regular classrooms and that children with mental retardation are much more likely than children with other disabilities to be in segregated settings. Ranking of states by a weighted formula finds most states place fewer than 10 percent of children with mental retardation in regular classes. The paper ends with a call to action for policymakers and administrators in the federal, state, and local governments as well as Arc chapter members. An appendix provides a table of state data. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED352778

The Arc

a national organization on mental retardation

(formerly The Association for Retarded Citizens of the United States)

REPORT CARD TO THE NATION ON INCLUSION IN EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION

by

Sharon Davis, Ph.D.
Director, The Arc's
Department of Research
and Program Services

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. A. Davis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

October 1992

EC 301708

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

With Assistance From:

Members of The Arc's Program Services for Children and Adults Committee:
Brenda Doss, Chair
John Foley
T. J. Monroe
Maureen Scipione
Joan Thompson

Ralph Moore, Chairperson, Governmental Affairs Committee

Larry Jones, Volunteer, The Arc of King County, Washington

Alan Abeson, Ed.D., Executive Director

Paul Marchand, Director, Governmental Affairs

Rick Berkobien, Assistant Director, Research and Program Services

Mike Wehmeyer, Ph.D., Director, Self-Determination Project

Carrie Brown, Ph.D., Director, Bioengineering Program

Debby Ingram, Director, Family Support Project

The Arc
500 E. Border St., S-300
Arlington, Texas 76010
(817) 261-6003
TDD (817) 277-2553

REPORT CARD TO THE NATION ON INCLUSION IN EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION

INTRODUCTION

Declaring, "Inclusion is a right, not a privilege for a select few," the Honorable John F. Gerry, Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey ordered a New Jersey school district to develop an inclusive education plan for Rafael Oberti, an eight year old boy with severe intellectual and communications disabilities (Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia, August, 1992). The school district had argued that Rafael's low level of intellectual functioning precluded him from participating in regular class and that his behavior would be disruptive in the neighborhood school. Thus, the school district insisted the most appropriate place for him was in a self-contained classroom located in an out-of-district school for "multiply handicapped" children.

In ordering an inclusive education plan for Rafael, the court made several findings of fact regarding the education of children with severe handicapping conditions, including:

- "Rafael and children like him may be harmed by being placed in segregated classes, away from friends and family, and surrounded by inappropriate role models."
- "Success in special schools and special classes is unlikely to lead to Rafael functioning successfully either in integrated education settings or in the community."
- "Rafael and all children with disabilities need access to integrated experiences where they can learn to function effectively. Correspondingly, nondisabled people need to learn to function with disabled people through such

experiences" (Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District - C.A. No. 91-2818. D.N.J. 8/17/92).

WHY IS INCLUSION IMPORTANT TO THE ARC?

Inclusion refers to the opportunity for all students to participate in the totality of the school experience. It includes integration into regular classrooms in neighborhood schools for both educational and social opportunities. More than this, however, it means that students with mental retardation participate in or attend extracurricular activities such as sports and school plays, eat and socialize with peers in the school lunchroom, and engage in other school activities from which they are often excluded.

For more than 15 years, federal policy (Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) - Public Law 94-142) has required school districts to consider placing a child with disabilities in a regular classroom setting with the use of supplementary aids and services before exploring other more restrictive alternatives. The law also requires that alternative placements be available to meet the individual needs of a child when they cannot be met in the regular classroom. Through the years, schools have interpreted the law to mean that segregated settings such as separate classrooms and separate schools are appropriate placements for students with mental retardation.

In recent years, the concept of inclusive education has emerged and has been affirmed in court cases, such as the one cited above and that of Rachel Holland in California. In a recent case, Judge David F. Levi, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, ruled that Rachel had the right to be educated in a regular classroom and pointed out, after analyzing the intent of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, that "a placement in other than a regular class is a fallback choice made only after it is determined that placement in regular classes

will be unsuccessful" (Board of Education, Sacramento City Unified School District v. Rachel Holland - Civ. S-90-1171-DFL Order).

The Arc, in its 1990 position statement on education, affirmed some basic principles that reflect the beliefs of the association regarding the inclusion of students with mental retardation. These include:

- All schools should value all students and include them in all aspects of school life.
- Preparation for life in the community best occurs when all students of different backgrounds and abilities learn and socialize together in classrooms and other school settings where all have a chance to achieve and receive instruction designed to develop and enhance successful living within the community.
- Each student with a disability belongs in an age-appropriate classroom with peers who are not disabled.
- Each student has the right to receive individualized education which provides choices, meets the student's needs, and offers the necessary support.

BENEFITS OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

In an inclusive school system, special education and related support services are provided in typical school settings. This includes instruction in regular education classes and participation in extracurricular activities. For most school districts, this is a new way of serving students with disabilities. Many students, particularly those with mental retardation, have been considered too "handicapped" to succeed in the regular school setting. However, in recent years, research has documented the benefits of inclusion to both children with disabilities and their nondisabled peers (PEAK Parent Center, Inc., 1989). These include:

- Students with disabilities meet an increased number of their individualized education program (IEP) goals in integrated settings.

- Students with disabilities are more motivated to learn in integrated settings.
- Regular education provides access to peer models to facilitate learning and appropriate social behaviors.
- Through integration, students with disabilities encounter the expectations and diversity of society.
- Graduates of integrated programs are more successful as adults.
- Friendships develop between classmates with and without disabilities.
- Students without disabilities learn to appreciate and accept individual differences and to appreciate the abilities and strengths of their classmates with disabilities.

While these benefits are often cited to justify why children with disabilities belong in the regular education setting, inclusion does not need to be justified on this basis, for it is really a matter of human dignity and civil rights. "Segregation is the way in which society tells a group of human beings that they are inferior to other groups of human beings in that society" (Testimony of Kenneth Clarke, Brown v. Board of Education, 1956). Segregated settings for students with mental retardation symbolize their rejection by society. Only when students with and without disabilities are educated side by side can they experience the richness of a society that values and includes all its citizens. Like all students, those with mental retardation have the right and must be given the opportunity to attend regular schools and regular classes, and to receive an appropriate education in those settings.

EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENTS OF CHILDREN WITH MENTAL RETARDATION

In order to determine the extent to which children with mental retardation are being educated in inclusive settings, The Arc analyzed the latest data on educational placements of students with mental retardation contained in the Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1992). The report summarizes data for the 1989-90 school year reported by all states to the federal government regarding children receiving special education and related services. States obtain this information annually from their local education agencies.

States must classify student placements according to six different educational environments. They are described below, starting with the most inclusive setting (the regular classroom) and ending with the least inclusive setting (homebound or hospitalized).

Regular Class includes students who receive a majority of their education in a regular class and receive special education and related services for less than 21 percent of the school day. It includes children placed in a regular class and receiving special education within the regular class as well as children placed in a regular class and receiving special education outside the regular class.

Resource room includes students who receive special education and related services for 21 to 60 percent of the school day. This may include resource rooms with part-time instruction in the regular class.

Separate class includes students who receive special education and related services for more than 60 percent of the school day. Students may be placed in self-contained special classrooms with part-time instruction in regular classes or placed in self-contained classes full-time on a regular school campus.

Separate school facility includes students who receive special education and related services in separate public or private schools for students with disabilities for greater than 50 percent of the school day.

Residential facility includes students who receive education in a public or private residential facility, at public expense, for greater than 50 percent of the school day.

Homebound/hospital environment includes students placed in and receiving special education in hospital or homebound programs.

Table 1 displays national data on numbers and percentage of students with mental retardation in each educational environment for the school year 1989-90. The numbers in Table 1 represent totals for 50 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

TABLE 1
NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION AGE 6-21 PLACED IN DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1989-90

Environment	Numbers	Percent
Regular class	37,862	6.7
Resource room	112,908	20.1
Separate class	343,050	61.1
Public separate facility	51,247	9.1
Private separate facility	6,581	1.2
Public residential facility	5,528	1.0
Private residential facility	2,271	.4
Homebound/hospital	2,122	.4
Total	561,569	100.0

Source: Table AB2, *Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress*, 1992. (See Appendix A.)

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE CHILDREN WITH MENTAL RETARDATION BEING EDUCATED IN THE SAME CLASSROOMS AS THEIR NONDISABLED PEERS?

National Data

As can be seen from Table 1, fewer than 7 percent of students with mental retardation receive their education in the regular classroom, the most inclusive setting. An additional 20 percent are educated in resource rooms for 21 to 60 percent of the day. Some of these students may also receive part-time instruction in the regular class setting. This means that fewer than 30 percent of students with mental retardation interact with their nondisabled peers in a classroom setting on a regular basis.

Almost 12 percent of students with mental retardation receive their special education in totally separate schools (combined percentages for facility placements). This means they are almost two times as likely to be totally segregated as they are to be included in a regular classroom.

State by State Data

There are great variations among states in the settings in which children receive their education. Table 2 illustrates the percentage of students with mental retardation served in regular classroom settings by each state (and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) during the 1989-90 school year. Significant findings include the following:

- Only two states educate more than 50 percent of students with mental retardation in regular classes: Massachusetts (59%) and Vermont (54%).
- Another two states educate 25-50 percent in the regular classroom: Wyoming (36%) and New Hampshire (25%).
- Four additional states serve 10 to 25 percent in regular classes: Idaho (19%), Nebraska (16%), Arkansas (12%) and North Carolina (12%).

TABLE 2

Percentage of Students With Mental Retardation Age 6-21 Served in Regular Classes During School Year 1989-90: State Ranking.

Rank	State	Percentage
1	Massachusetts	59.25
2	Vermont	54.06
3	Wyoming	36.02
4	New Hampshire	25.22
5	Idaho	18.50
6	Nebraska	15.50
7	Arkansas	11.54
8	North Carolina	11.53
9	Maine	8.41
10	Washington	8.14
11	Alabama	8.10
12	Tennessee	7.97
13	North Dakota	7.94
14	Oklahoma	7.85
15	Montana	7.79
16	Oregon	7.19
17	Utah	6.25
18	Kentucky	6.20
19	Michigan	6.13
20	Alaska	5.76
21	Nevada	5.31
22	Kansas	5.29
23	South Carolina	5.27
24	Missouri	5.17
25	West Virginia	4.97
26	Delaware	4.83
27	Maryland	3.58
28	Wisconsin	3.38
29	New Mexico	3.18
30	California	3.16
31	Minnesota	2.95
32	Connecticut	2.50
33	Virginia	2.32
34	Ohio	2.25
35	Colorado	2.18
36	Hawaii	1.75
37	Texas	1.62
38	South Dakota	1.48
39	Louisiana	1.39
40	Pennsylvania	1.37
41	Rhode Island	1.36
42	Puerto Rico	1.34
43	Arizona	1.26
44	Mississippi	.82
45	District of Columbia	.75
46	Florida	.58
47	New Jersey	.51
48	Iowa	.33
49	Illinois	.31
50	Indiana	.30
51	Georgia	.27
52	New York	.26

- The remaining 44 states serve fewer than 10 percent in the regular classroom.

- Nine states place fewer than one percent of students with mental retardation in regular classrooms: New York, Georgia, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, New Jersey, Florida, District of Columbia and Mississippi.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE STATES USING RESOURCE ROOMS TO EDUCATE STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION?

National Data

According to Table 1, overall 20 percent of states use resource rooms to provide special education to students with mental retardation. Assuming some of these students spend part-time in the regular classroom, they probably have more inclusive school experiences than those students in separate classrooms for most of the day. However, use of resource rooms varies considerably by state, ranging from almost no use to 64 percent of students in such settings.

State by State Data

Table 3 displays the percentages of students in resource rooms by states. Some findings are:

- Three states have more than 50 percent of their students with mental retardation in resource rooms: Iowa (64%), South Dakota (63%) and Kentucky (55%).

- An additional 18 states place between 25 to 50 percent of these students in resource rooms.

- The remaining 31 states use the resource room for fewer than 25 percent of students with mental retardation.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Students With Mental Retardation Age 6-21 Served in Resource Rooms During School Year 1989-90. State Ranking.

Rank	State	Percentage
1	Iowa	64.15
2	South Dakota	63.05
3	Kentucky	54.59
4	Arkansas	45.12
5	Delaware	40.27
6	Minnesota	39.74
7	Maine	38.18
8	Puerto Rico	37.59
9	Tennessee	36.00
10	Wyoming	35.70
11	South Carolina	35.10
12	North Carolina	34.79
13	Oklahoma	34.16
14	Nebraska	32.07
15	Idaho	31.17
16	New Mexico	29.53
17	Washington	29.13
18	West Virginia	28.94
19	Mississippi	28.07
20	Georgia	26.96
21	Wisconsin	25.96
22	Utah	24.87
23	Alaska	24.35
24	Nevada	22.41
25	Colorado	21.19
26	Oregon	21.16
27	Virginia	21.14
28	Alabama	20.27
29	Montana	19.70
30	Arizona	19.20
31	Hawaii	19.06
32	North Dakota	18.55
33	Pennslyvania	16.20
34	District of Columbia	15.90
35	Massachusetts	15.72
36	Connecticut	15.20
37	Michigan	13.72
38	Missouri	12.92
39	Texas	12.69
40	New Hampshire	11.64
41	Kansas	10.56
42	Indiana	9.15
43	Ohio	9.08
44	Vermont	8.66
45	Maryland	7.73
46	Louisiana	6.28
47	Florida	4.52
48	New York	4.03
49	Illinois	2.59
50	Rhode Island	2.14
51	New Jersey	1.84
52	California	1.74

- Six states use it for fewer than 5 percent: California, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Illinois, New York and Florida.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION BEING EDUCATED IN SEPARATE CLASSROOMS?

National Data

The most common setting for educating students with mental retardation is in separate classrooms. Table 1 shows that 61 percent receive their special education in this setting. Some of these students may receive part-time instruction in regular classes, but most are typically served full-time in a self-contained setting and have very little interaction with students without disabilities.

State by State Data

Table 4 displays information about individual state's use of separate classrooms for serving students with mental retardation. Findings include:

- Thirty-five states use this educational environment for more than 50 percent of the students with mental retardation they serve.

- Three states serve more than 80 percent in separate classes: Ohio (84%), Indiana (83%) and California (81%).

- An additional 10 states serve between 70 to 80 percent of students with mental retardation in separate classrooms: Kansas, Rhode Island, Hawaii, Texas, Illinois, Colorado, Louisiana, Florida, Pennsylvania and Montana.

- Only two states serve fewer than 20 percent of students with mental retardation in separate classes: Wyoming (10%) and Massachusetts (18%).

TABLE 4

Percentage of Students With Mental Retardation Age 6-21 Served in Separate Classes During School Year 1989-90: State Ranking.

Rank	State	Percentage
1	Wyoming	9.64
2	Massachusetts	18.05
3	South Dakota	22.75
4	Delaware	26.29
5	Iowa	29.08
6	Vermont	33.11
7	Arkansas	33.75
8	Kentucky	36.34
9	Nevada	41.67
10	North Carolina	44.05
11	Nebraska	44.69
12	Idaho	44.84
13	Puerto Rico	46.04
14	New Hampshire	47.09
15	Maine	47.89
16	Tennessee	48.06
17	South Carolina	49.84
18	Maryland	50.92
19	District of Columbia	51.56
20	New Jersey	51.71
21	Michigan	52.38
22	Minnesota	53.90
23	Oklahoma	54.98
24	Missouri	56.83
25	West Virginia	59.43
26	Washington	59.80
27	Connecticut	60.18
28	Utah	62.51
29	New York	63.25
30	Wisconsin	63.93
31	New Mexico	63.97
32	Mississippi	66.19
33	North Dakota	67.76
34	Oregon	68.19
35	Georgia	68.38
36	Arizona	68.53
37	Virginia	68.54
38	Alabama	69.07
39	Alaska	69.90
40	Montana	71.11
41	Pennsylvania	71.15
42	Florida	72.20
43	Louisiana	73.15
44	Colorado	73.76
45	Illinois	74.41
46	Texas	75.07
47	Hawaii	75.77
48	Rhode Island	77.26
49	Kansas	78.68
50	California	80.90
51	Indiana	83.02
52	Ohio	84.21

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION STILL BEING EDUCATED IN SEPARATE SCHOOLS?

National Data

For this report, children placed in public and private separate facilities and residential facilities are all considered as being served in a separate school. According to the data in Table 1, these segregated settings still serve about 12 percent of all students with mental retardation. Other research has found that many states continue to use separate schools extensively for children with disabilities, in spite of years of implementation of P.L. 94-142 and the requirement to place children in the least restrictive environment (Danielson and Bellamy, 1989).

State by State Data

In many states, students with mental retardation continue to receive the majority of their special education in totally separate schools. Table 5 combines the percentages of students served in public and private separate schools (day and residential) and reveals:

- Seven states serve more than 25 percent of students with mental retardation in separate schools: New Jersey (46%), Maryland (38%), New York (32%), District of Columbia (32%), Nevada (31%), Delaware (28%) and Michigan (28%).
- Only Alaska reports no use of separate schools.
- Seven states serve fewer than three percent of students with mental retardation in separate schools: Montana, Alabama, Kentucky, Colorado, Washington, New Mexico and Oklahoma.
- The remaining 37 states educate 3 to 25 percent of students with mental retardation in separate schools.

TABLE 5

Percentage of Students Age 6-21 Served in Separate Schools During School Year 1989-90: State Ranking.

Rank	State	Percentage
1	Alaska	0.00
2	Montana	0.56
3	Alabama	2.41
4	Kentucky	2.44
5	Colorado	2.77
6	Washington	2.82
7	New Mexico	2.83
8	Oklahoma	2.84
9	Oregon	3.00
10	Hawaii	3.18
11	Minnesota	3.21
12	Vermont	3.49
13	Idaho	3.87
14	Mississippi	4.26
15	Georgia	4.28
16	Ohio	4.35
17	Maine	5.09
18	Kansas	5.36
19	North Dakota	5.74
20	Utah	6.03
21	Iowa	6.37
22	Massachusetts	6.39
23	West Virginia	6.43
24	Wisconsin	6.59
25	Nebraska	7.42
26	Indiana	7.45
27	Virginia	7.66
28	Tennessee	7.80
29	Arkansas	8.80
30	North Carolina	9.26
31	South Carolina	9.43
32	Texas	10.15
33	Pennsylvania	10.86
34	Arizona	10.91
35	South Dakota	12.66
36	Puerto Rico	13.25
37	California	14.20
38	New Hampshire	15.85
39	Rhode Island	18.17
40	Wyoming	18.48
41	Louisiana	18.70
42	Connecticut	21.32
43	Florida	22.30
44	Illinois	22.64
45	Missouri	23.67
46	Michigan	27.58
47	Delaware	27.78
48	Nevada	30.60
49	District of Columbia	31.69
50	New York	31.88
51	Maryland	37.59
52	New Jersey	45.59

WHAT PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION RECEIVE THEIR EDUCATION IN SEPARATE CLASSROOMS AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS?

National Data

If the data on students served in separate classrooms are combined with the data on those served in separate schools, 73 percent of all students with mental retardation in the country are provided their educational programs in segregated settings.

State by State Data

Table 6 combines percentages of students in separate classrooms and separate schools to display how the states rank in utilizing these two types of educational placements. Selected findings are as follows:

- Eight states place more than 90 percent of students with mental retardation in separate settings: New Jersey (97%), Illinois (97%), Rhode Island (95%), New York (95%), California (95%, Florida (95%), Louisiana (92%) and Indiana (91%).

- An additional eight states place more than 80 percent of students with mental retardation in separate settings: Ohio, Maryland, Texas, Kansas, District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Missouri.

- The six states serving the fewest (less than 40 percent) students with mental retardation in these two segregating settings are: Massachusetts (24%) Wyoming (28%), South Dakota (35%), Iowa (35%), Vermont (37%) and Kentucky (39%).

TABLE 6

Percentage of Students With Mental Retardation Age 6-21 Served in Separate Classes and Schools During School Year 1989-90: State Ranking.

Rank	State	Percentage
1	Massachusetts	24.44
2	Wyoming	28.12
3	South Dakota	35.41
4	Iowa	35.45
5	Vermont	36.60
6	Kentucky	38.78
7	Arkansas	42.55
8	Idaho	48.71
9	Nebraska	52.11
10	Maine	52.98
11	North Carolina	53.31
12	Delaware	54.07
13	Tennessee	55.86
14	Minnesota	57.11
15	Oklahoma	57.82
16	South Carolina	59.27
17	Puerto Rico	59.29
18	Washington	62.62
19	New Hampshire	62.94
20	West Virginia	65.86
21	New Mexico	66.80
22	Utah	68.54
23	Alaska	69.90
24	Mississippi	70.45
25	Wisconsin	70.52
26	Oregon	71.19
27	Alabama	71.48
28	Montana	71.67
29	Nevada	72.27
30	Georgia	72.66
31	North Dakota	73.50
32	Virginia	76.20
33	Colorado	76.53
34	Hawaii	78.95
35	Arizona	79.44
36	Michigan	79.96
37	Missouri	80.50
38	Connecticut	81.50
39	Pennsylvania	82.01
40	District of Columbia	83.25
41	Kansas	84.04
42	Texas	85.22
43	Maryland	88.51
44	Ohio	88.56
45	Indiana	90.47
46	Louisiana	91.85
47	Florida	94.50
48	California	95.10
49	New York	95.13
50	Rhode Island	95.43
51	Illinois	97.05
52	New Jersey	97.30

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Placement in Regular Classes

Only 6.7 percent of our nation's children with mental retardation were educated in regular classrooms in the 1989-90 school year. Clearly, few states consider the regular classroom as the appropriate placement for children with mental retardation. Only two states, Massachusetts and Vermont, have more than 50 percent of children in this setting. Most states placed fewer than 5 percent in a regular class.

Data on all children with disabilities were examined to determine how children with mental retardation compared in terms of educational placements. As a whole, 31.5 percent * of all children with disabilities were educated in the regular classroom. Comparing the 6.7 percent figure for children with mental retardation with the 31.5 percent of all children with disabilities reveals that **children with mental retardation are almost 5 times less likely to be educated in a regular classroom.**

As they grow older, children with mental retardation are even less likely to be allowed in regular classroom settings. Of those age 6-11, 8.52 percent were in regular classes; 5.90 percent of those age 12-17; and 4.62 percent of those age 18-21. An explanation for this gradual drop in numbers may be that schools typically begin the inclusion process with elementary age children because more successful models for full inclusion have been demonstrated at this level. Fewer models for secondary level students have been developed and tested. An additional factor may be that parents of younger children are more insistent in requesting the regular classroom placement because they know its benefits.

* This figure includes children with mental retardation, as raw data were not yet available to separate them out of the total. If children with mental retardation were removed from this figure, the percentage for the rest of the children clearly would be higher as their low percentage brings down the average for all.

Placement in Separate Schools

Twelve percent of children with mental retardation are placed in separate schools for their education. Seven states place more than one-fourth of all students with mental retardation in this most segregated setting. Only Alaska reports no use of separate schools.

Comparing the 12 percent of students with mental retardation with the 5.5 percent of all children with disabilities placed in separate schools reveals that **children with mental retardation are more than two times as likely to be placed in a separate school than all children with disabilities**.

The use of separate schools was also examined to note changes as children with mental retardation grow older. Data show that 8.42 percent of children age 6-11; 10.07 percent of children age 12-17 and 27.14 percent of children age 18-21 are placed in separate schools. Part of the explanation for this is that change toward full inclusion has started in the lower grades. As children get older, schools may not be ready to implement inclusive programs. In addition, after age 16, many students with mental retardation (about 25 percent) drop out of school. Those who remain have more severe mental retardation and are usually the most segregated.

States' Rankings on Inclusive Settings

In order to compare states on the inclusiveness of the settings in which they educate children with mental retardation, a formula for weighting the educational placements used by schools was devised. The most inclusive setting, regular class, was assigned a weight of 4; the resource room was assigned a weight of 2; the separate class a weight of 1; and the separate school which is not at all inclusive was assigned a weight of 0.

Using these weights, an inclusion score was calculated for each state as follows:

1. The number of children with mental retardation the state had placed in each of the four settings was multiplied by the assigned weight. The weighted scores for each setting were added to develop a weighted total score for each state.

2. The weighted total was divided by the total number of children with mental retardation served by each state to develop an inclusion score. This score could range from 0.0 (if all students were placed in separate schools) to 4.0 (if all students were educated in regular classes). (See Appendix B for the full table showing numbers of children, weighted totals and inclusion scores.)

Table 7 illustrates the results of the above calculations. States are ranked from the most inclusive to the least inclusive in how they serve children with mental retardation and are assigned grades.

Report Card Grades

The grades for each state in Table 7 are based on The Arc's interpretation of the federal data. States were graded in terms of how extensively they provide an inclusive education program for children with mental retardation, with placement in the regular classroom carrying the most weight and placement in a separate school carrying no weight. Based on The Arc's analysis of the inclusion scores, grades were assigned as follows:

- No state deserves an "A" or "B." Only two states, Massachusetts and Vermont, score above 2.50. These are also the only two states that place more than 50 percent of children with mental retardation in regular classes. Thus, The Arc believes they have earned a "C."

TABLE 7

State Ranking on Inclusion Score and Grade Assigned by The Arc.

Rank	State	Inclusion Score	Grade
1	Massachusetts	2.88	C
2	Vermont	2.68	C
3	Wyoming	2.25	D
4	Idaho	1.84	D
5	New Hampshire	1.72	D
6	Arkansas	1.71	D
7	Nebraska	1.71	D
8	Kentucky	1.71	D
9	North Carolina	1.60	F
10	Iowa	1.59	F
11	Maine	1.59	F
12	Oklahoma	1.55	F
13	South Dakota	1.55	F
14	Tennessee	1.52	F
15	Washington	1.51	F
16	Minnesota	1.45	F
17	Montana	1.43	F
18	Alabama	1.42	F
19	South Carolina	1.42	F
20	Alaska	1.42	F
21	Oregon	1.40	F
22	North Dakota	1.38	F
23	Utah	1.38	F
24	West Virginia	1.38	F
25	New Mexico	1.36	F
26	Wisconsin	1.30	F
27	Puerto Rico	1.29	F
28	Delaware	1.27	F
29	Mississippi	1.26	F
30	Colorado	1.25	F
31	Georgia	1.24	F
32	Hawaii	1.21	F
33	Kansas	1.21	F
34	Virginia	1.20	F
35	Arizona	1.12	F
36	Ohio	1.11	F
37	Pennsylvania	1.09	F
38	Nevada	1.08	F
39	Texas	1.07	F
40	Missouri	1.05	F
41	Michigan	1.05	F
42	Indiana	1.03	F
43	Connecticut	1.01	F
44	California	0.97	F
45	Louisiana	0.92	F
46	Rhode Island	0.88	F
47	D.C.	0.86	F
48	Florida	0.84	F
49	Illinois	0.81	F
50	Maryland	0.81	F
51	New York	0.73	F
52	New Jersey	0.58	F

- These two states are followed by Wyoming, Idaho, New Hampshire, Arkansas, Nebraska and Kentucky, all with scores above 1.60. All but Kentucky place more than 10 percent of students with mental retardation in regular classrooms. Kentucky makes extensive use of the resource room and places very few children in separate schools. These states are assigned "Ds."

- All other states are assigned "Fs" because they either do not serve 10 percent of children with mental retardation in regular class or they claim high use of separate classrooms and separate schools.

- The bottom five states, those placing children with mental retardation in the least inclusive settings are New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Illinois and Florida. These are assigned to the "Hall of Shame," because in addition to having the lowest inclusion scores, these five states are found in the worst 10 list for most use of separate schools and in the worst 10 list for least use of regular classrooms and resource rooms.

DISCUSSION

The Arc recognizes that placement in the regular education setting does not necessarily mean that a child with mental retardation is fully included in the life of the school. However, proximity is a necessary first step. The availability of appropriate supports to succeed academically and socially in the regular classroom is essential and is also not measured by the data.

It should also be pointed out that states are dependent on local education agencies for accurate reporting of the data. The categories of placements are defined in terms of time spent in special education and could be subject to misinterpretation or different interpretations by various school districts. However, this is the data reported to the United States Congress, and because it is collected

and reported by all states annually, it provides a useful basis for examining educational settings for children with mental retardation.

Dramatically revealed by this study is that in terms of meeting the requirements of both federal and state law, as well as in using proven educational practice, the nation is failing. As is obvious, most states have a long way to go to achieve full inclusion for students with mental retardation. Local and state education agencies have perpetuated practices which segregate and demean children with mental retardation for far too long and have been permitted to do so by the federal government.

The federal Office of Special Education Programs which is charged with monitoring each state's compliance with P.L. 94-142 has not established effective policies and procedures to enforce the law. Under the currently used monitoring schedule for example, the federal government scrutinizes each state every five and a half to six years, an unacceptably long time between visits. Few states have been issued findings of non-compliance for failing to demonstrate as required that education in the regular classroom with proper support has been considered for all children in the development of their Individualized Education Programs. In addition, even when states are found out of compliance, the government's monitoring of the corrective action plans developed tends to be passive rather than aggressive.

While it can be said that federal monitoring activities have been ineffective in causing schools to become more inclusive for children with mental retardation, other federal activities are beginning to effect change in the segregated systems of special education. Some states have begun to recognize the validity of inclusion in the regular class for children with all disabilities, no matter how severe, because of federal systems change grants. To date, at least 16 states have received funding to support planning, preparation and implementation of full inclusion for all children

receiving special education. The expectation of The Arc is that as a result of these grants, dramatic increases will be achieved in inclusion efforts for children with mental retardation and other disabilities as well.

The Office of Special Education Programs operates other grant programs which are now beginning to fund research, model demonstrations and in-service training related to inclusive education. Critically needed, however, to effectively assist schools to change the way they currently provide special education programs is for major modifications to be made in preservice undergraduate and graduate level personnel preparation programs. These university programs which are heavily funded by the federal government and regulated by state education agencies must prepare teachers, administrators and related services personnel to provide special education and related services to children who are integrated in regular classrooms.

To date, the major impetus for full inclusion has been the advocacy of The Arc, several other national disability organizations and individual parents and professionals. Advocating for full inclusion of children with disabilities has also attracted the interest and support of some key organizations in the regular education community, as well. The National Education Association and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development have adopted positions recognizing the value of inclusion. Unfortunately, the major association representing the special education profession, the Council for Exceptional Children, recently chose to affirm in its policy statement on educational environments that complete removal from regular education classrooms should be an administrative option and that "It may even be necessary to remove some children from their homes and communities in order for them to receive education and related services in residential schools, hospitals, or training centers" TASH Newsletter, July 1992). With the special education professional community represented by CEC opposing

inclusion in regular education classrooms for many children, advocates must look to government at the federal, state and local school level to enforce the provisions of law.

THE ARC'S CALL TO ACTION FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

The grades are in and essentially the country has failed in meeting its obligations to educate children with mental retardation in regular classes alongside their non-disabled peers. This report provides baseline data which show that more than 93 percent of children with mental retardation are educated in settings other than the regular classroom and that various governmental authorities have not fulfilled their responsibilities. This is especially tragic and wasteful because the research demonstrates benefits to children with and without disabilities, and individual committed schools across the nation have demonstrated that it can be done.

The Arc prepared this report to stimulate action toward the goal of full inclusion in the nation's public schools for all children with mental retardation and other disabilities. To effect this major change in how special education and related services are provided means action is needed at the national, state and local level. The Arc calls specifically on the federal government and all state governments as well as advocacy organizations, including all chapters of The Arc, to initiate or renew their efforts to achieve the full inclusion of children with mental retardation in the nation's schools by the Year 2000. As an interim goal, The Arc calls on the nation's schools to be educating at least 50 percent of children with mental retardation in regular classrooms by 1995. Since two states have already met the interim goal in 1989-90, The Arc believes this target is reasonable.

THE PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

The Arc calls for action by policymakers and administrators at all levels of public education:

The Federal Government

- The Congress must insist on and the administration must fulfill its statutory responsibility to aggressively enforce the law. To date no state has failed to receive funds because it did not comply with P.L. 94-142. The Office of Special Education Programs must greatly improve its monitoring efforts (assuring each state is monitored once every three years) and enforcement of states' compliance with all aspects of the law.

- While The Arc recognizes the importance of the efforts now being supported by the federal government to facilitate inclusion, including the systems change grants to states, much more needs to be done. Critically important is for OSEP to address the achievement of full inclusion in all its funded programs including preservice and inservice training, research and demonstration activities and all information and technical assistance programs.

State Government

- As required by federal and state law as well, all states that receive funds under IDEA must ensure that all local education agencies are in compliance with IDEA or they risk losing the federal financial assistance. Consequently, state education agencies like their federal counterparts have an obligation to engage in aggressive monitoring and provide assistance to school districts to achieve full inclusion.

- Since licensing teachers, administrators and related services personnel is a state responsibility, existing requirements should be enhanced to ensure that all personnel receiving credit as a result of pre or inservice training will have been trained to practice their speciality for all children in inclusive settings.

Local Government

- Local education agencies must make the same commitment to all children with mental retardation as for all children in providing them with an education designed to prepare them for participation in a diverse society.

- Translating this commitment to action, all schools should adopt, as a priority in their staff development and parent education programs, information about the purpose, technique and benefit to providing inclusive programs for children with mental retardation and other disabilities.

CHAPTERS OF THE ARC

The Arc calls on its 1200 chapters across the nation to work together to ensure that the children in their states and communities receive their education in inclusive settings.

- Since all states can improve in their efforts to date including those receiving the grade of C, all chapters should present this report to their state legislature and education agency officials, local boards of education and local school administrators and to parent/teacher and other organizations urging them to move toward full inclusion of all students. Using this data can be the centerpoint of an ongoing campaign of chapters to achieve the 1995 and 2000 targets

- Chapters should discover, celebrate and acknowledge those schools, classrooms and professionals who properly accomplish inclusion of children with mental retardation.

- Chapters must insist that by 1995 the antiquated and ineffective system of separate schools is totally eliminated.

- In the best tradition of The Arc, chapters must aggressively assist parents to advocate for inclusive education, including those who have children entering school, those already receiving special education and those whose children have left

school but recognize the future need. Parents must be trained to be informed consumers in order to advocate for revision in education policy to bring about inclusion and to join advisory councils, task forces, etc. to advocate for change in their schools. Chapters can also train and support parents to participate effectively in the IEP process to achieve the regular classroom placement for their own child and to monitor local schools' practices regarding inclusion.

CONCLUSION

For The Arc, setting a target date of Year 2000 for achieving full inclusion for all children with mental retardation is disheartening, because there is no reason why all of these students are not already receiving their education in such settings. In the mid-1970s when integration was a new concept, it was understandable that learning on the part of school officials, practitioners and parents was necessary. No longer however is that a viable excuse. Today, practical know-how, scientific knowledge, resource materials and even technology exist in sufficient supply to meet this essential and beneficial national goal. All that is required now is the will to achieve this mandate for all children with mental retardation and related disabilities. For the children in school today and tomorrow and for the benefit of the society today and tomorrow, no more time can be wasted.

As Judge Gerry wrote in concluding his Opinion regarding Rafael Oberti's education:

> "Both the IDEA and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act seek to address the problems created by the segregation of individuals with disabilities and compel the type of integration which we are enforcing in this case. While this surely requires readjustment and considerable effort on the part of educators, and on the part of the community in general, it is a small price to pay to increase the opportunity of individuals with disabilities to become fully-functioning, productive, and co-equal members of society, and of individuals without disabilities to learn to live in a world where individuals with disabilities are so included" (Oberti v. Board of Education).

REFERENCES

1. Board of Education, Sacramento City Unified School District v. Rachel Holland - Civ. S-90-1171-DFL Order.

2. Danielson, L.C. and Bellamy, G.F. (1989, Feb.). "State Variation in Placement of Children with Handicaps in Segregated Environments." Exceptional Children. Vol. 55, No. 5, pp. 448-455.

3. Oberti v. Board of Education of the Borough of Clementon School District - C.A. No. 91-2818. D.N.J. 8/17/92.

4. PEAK Parent Center, Inc. (1989). Fact Sheet.

5. Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia. (1992, Aug. 24). Memo.

6. TASH Newsletter. (1992, July). "CEC Slips Back; ASCD Steps Forward." Vol. 18, Issue 7, p.1.

7. The Arc, Position Statement on Education. (1990).

TABLE AB2

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN AGE 6-21 SERVED IN
DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS
DURING THE 1989-90 SCHOOL YEAR

MENTAL RETARDATION

STATE	PERCENTAGE							
	REGULAR CLASS	RESOURCE ROOM	SEPARATE CLASS	PUBLIC SEPARATE FACILITY	PRIVATE SEPARATE FACILITY	PUBLIC RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL FACILITY	HOMEBOUND HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENT
ALABAMA	0.10	20.27	69.07	2.20	0.06	0.15	0.00	0.16
ALASKA	5.76	24.35	69.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ARIZONA	1.26	19.20	68.53	8.93	1.62	0.02	0.34	0.10
ARKANSAS	11.54	45.12	33.75	2.05	3.20	1.90	1.65	0.79
CALIFORNIA	3.16	1.74	80.90	9.48	1.13	3.59	0.00	0.00
COLORADO	2.18	21.19	73.76	1.68	0.89	0.07	0.13	0.10
CONNECTICUT	2.50	15.20	60.18	15.64	3.94	0.19	1.55	0.81
DELAWARE	4.83	40.27	26.29	26.12	0.00	0.08	1.58	0.83
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	0.75	15.90	51.56	26.21	4.08	0.00	1.40	0.11
FLORIDA	0.58	4.52	72.30	21.71	0.36	0.10	0.13	0.31
GEORGIA	0.27	26.96	68.38	1.29	0.05	2.89	0.05	0.11
HAWAII	1.75	19.06	75.77	2.46	0.56	0.00	0.16	0.24
IDAHO	18.50	31.17	44.84	2.32	0.04	1.51	0.00	1.62
ILLINOIS	0.31	2.59	74.41	12.60	6.47	1.06	2.51	0.06
INDIANA	0.30	9.15	83.02	7.22	0.00	0.14	0.09	0.09
IOWA	0.33	64.15	29.08	5.44	0.00	0.84	0.09	0.07
KANSAS	5.29	10.56	78.68	1.75	0.00	2.73	0.88	0.11
KENTUCKY	6.20	54.59	36.34	1.95	0.31	0.17	0.01	0.43
LOUISIANA	1.39	6.28	73.15	12.21	0.16	6.00	0.33	0.48
MAINE	8.41	38.18	47.89	1.94	3.15	0.00	0.00	0.43
MARYLAND	3.58	7.73	50.92	33.96	2.75	0.17	0.71	0.19
MASSACHUSETTS	59.25	15.72	18.05	2.09	3.11	0.54	0.65	0.58
MICHIGAN	6.13	13.72	52.38	27.51	.	0.05	0.02	0.19
MINNESOTA	2.95	39.74	53.90	3.21	.	.	.	0.21
MISSISSIPPI	0.82	28.07	66.19	2.58	0.01	1.60	0.07	0.67
MISSOURI	5.17	12.92	56.83	22.41	0.98	0.26	0.02	1.39
MONTANA	7.79	19.70	71.11	0.19	0.00	0.09	0.28	0.84
NEBRASKA	15.50	32.07	44.69	4.85	0.37	1.88	0.32	0.34
NEVADA	5.31	22.41	41.67	30.51	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00
NEW HAMPSHIRE	25.22	11.64	47.09	2.59	9.91	0.22	3.13	0.22
NEW JERSEY	0.51	1.84	51.71	33.11	11.42	0.76	0.30	0.35
NEW MEXICO	3.18	29.53	63.97	0.65	0.00	2.18	0.00	0.50
NEW YORK	0.26	4.03	63.25	27.81	2.27	1.24	0.56	0.59
NORTH CAROLINA	11.53	34.79	44.05	7.25	0.62	0.24	1.15	0.38
NORTH DAKOTA	7.94	18.55	67.76	2.19	0.34	0.68	1.71	0.82
OHIO	2.25	9.08	84.21	3.42	0.25	0.68	.	0.11
OKLAHOMA	7.85	34.16	54.98	2.23	0.03	0.54	0.04	0.17
OREGON	7.19	21.16	68.19	0.98	0.29	1.70	0.03	0.46
PENNSYLVANIA	1.37	16.20	71.15	9.39	0.49	0.56	0.42	0.41
PUERTO RICO	1.34	37.59	46.04	10.61	1.99	0.56	0.09	1.79
RHODE ISLAND	1.36	2.14	77.26	0.10	16.81	0.00	1.26	1.07
SOUTH CAROLINA	5.27	35.10	49.84	7.09	0.60	1.72	0.02	0.37
SOUTH DAKOTA	1.48	63.05	22.75	0.13	3.02	1.48	8.03	0.06
TENNESSEE	7.97	36.00	48.06	3.73	2.25	1.71	0.11	0.18
TEXAS	1.62	12.69	75.07	8.89	0.16	0.33	0.77	0.47
UTAH	6.25	24.87	62.51	4.62	0.06	1.35	0.00	0.34
VERMONT	54.06	8.66	33.11	1.21	1.21	0.40	0.67	0.67
VIRGINIA	2.32	21.14	68.54	5.59	0.25	1.43	0.39	0.34
WASHINGTON	8.14	29.13	59.80	2.67	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.09
WEST VIRGINIA	4.97	28.94	59.43	5.43	0.00	0.99	0.01	0.23
WISCONSIN	3.38	25.96	63.93	6.44	0.04	0.11	0.00	0.15
WYOMING	36.02	35.70	9.64	3.95	0.00	13.27	1.26	0.16
AMERICAN SAMOA	44.90	34.18	0.00	20.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GUAM	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
NORTHERN MARIANAS	28.57	10.71	60.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PALAU	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
VIRGIN ISLANDS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
BUR. OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
U.S. AND INSULAR AREAS	6.76	20.11	61.07	9.13	1.17	0.98	0.40	0.38
50 STATES, D.C. & P.R.	6.74	20.11	61.09	9.13	1.17	0.98	0.40	0.38

DATA AS OF OCTOBER 1, 1991.

SOURCE: ANNUAL.CNTL(LBXXNP1A)
#OCT91

INCLUSION SCORES FOR THE NATION'S SCHOOLS

STATE	REGULAR CLASS *	RESOURCE ROOM *	SEPARATE CLASS *	SEPARATE SCHOOL *	TOTAL CHILDREN	WEIGHTED TOTAL **	INCLUSION SCORE ***
MASSACHUSETTS	16,774	4,450	5,111	1,810	28,145	81,107	2.88
VERMONT	805	129	493	52	1,479	3,971	2.68
WYOMING	228	226	61	117	632	1,425	2.25
IDAHO	479	807	1,161	100	2,547	4,691	1.84
NEW HAMPSHIRE	234	108	437	147	926	1,589	1.72
ARKANSAS	1,230	4,809	3,597	939	10,575	18,135	1.71
NEBRASKA	636	1,316	1,834	304	4,090	7,010	1.71
KENTUCKY	1,144	10,064	6,700	449	18,357	31,404	1.71
NORTH CAROLINA	2,437	7,352	9,310	1,955	21,054	33,762	1.60
IOWA	33	6,353	2,880	631	9,897	15,718	1.59
MAINE	196	885	1,110	118	2,308	3,660	1.59
OKLAHOMA	882	3,837	6,175	319	11,213	17,377	1.55
SOUTH DAKOTA	23	981	354	197	1,555	2,408	1.55
TENNESSEE	1,031	4,658	6,218	1,008	12,915	19,658	1.52
WASHINGTON	545	1,951	4,005	190	6,691	10,087	1.51
MINNESOTA	284	3,830	5,195	309	9,618	13,991	1.45
MONTANA	83	210	758	6	1,057	1,510	1.43
ALABAMA	2,165	5,420	18,471	644	26,700	37,971	1.42
SOUTH CAROLINA	777	5,170	7,341	1,388	14,676	20,789	1.42
ALASKA	22	93	267	0	382	541	1.42
OREGON	249	733	2,362	104	3,448	4,824	1.40
NORTH DAKOTA	116	271	990	72	1,449	1,996	1.38
UTAH	204	812	2,041	197	3,254	4,481	1.38
WEST VIRGINIA	411	2,393	4,914	532	8,250	11,344	1.38
NEW MEXICO	64	595	1,289	57	2,005	2,735	1.36
WISCONSIN	159	1,222	3,009	310	4,700	6,089	1.30
PUERTO RICO	213	5,995	7,343	2,112	15,663	20,185	1.29
DELAWARE	58	484	316	334	1,192	1,516	1.27
MISSISSIPPI	72	2,477	5,841	376	8,766	11,083	1.26
COLORADO	66	642	2,235	84	3,027	3,783	1.25
GEORGIA	62	6,130	15,547	973	22,712	28,055	1.24
HAWAII	22	240	954	40	1,256	1,522	1.21
KANSAS	287	573	4,269	291	5,420	6,563	1.21
VIRGINIA	293	2,672	8,664	969	12,598	15,180	1.20
ARIZONA	63	957	3,416	544	4,980	5,582	1.12
OHIO	949	3,833	35,561	1,837	42,180	47,023	1.11
PENNSYLVANIA	464	5,487	24,094	3,679	33,724	36,924	1.09
NEVADA	59	249	463	340	1,111	1,197	1.08
TEXAS	357	2,798	16,556	2,238	21,949	23,580	1.07
MISSOURI	978	2,442	10,741	4,476	18,637	19,537	1.05
MICHIGAN	1,141	2,556	9,758	5,137	18,592	19,434	1.05
INDIANA	58	1,795	16,285	1,461	19,599	20,107	1.03
CONNECTICUT	92	560	2,217	785	3,654	3,706	1.01
CALIFORNIA	760	419	19,444	3,413	24,036	23,322	0.97
LOUISIANA	148	669	7,791	1,992	10,600	9,721	0.92
RHODE ISLAND	14	22	795	187	1,018	895	0.88
D.C.	7	148	480	295	930	804	0.86
FLORIDA	141	1,106	17,688	5,456	24,391	20,464	0.84
MARYLAND	193	416	2,742	2,024	5,375	4,346	0.81
ILLINOIS	72	610	17,527	5,333	23,542	19,035	0.81
NEW YORK	54	848	13,298	6,701	20,899	15,208	0.73
NEW JERSEY	29	105	2,944	2,595	5,673	3,270	0.58
TOTAL	37,862	112,908	343,050	65,627	559,447	720,314	1.34

* NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN EACH SETTING

**WEIGHTED TOTAL IS DERIVED BY ASSIGNING THE FOLLOWING WEIGHTS TO EACH STUDENT IN EACH SETTING

REGULAR CLASS = 4 RESOURCE ROOM =2 SEPARATE CLASS =1 SEPARATE SCHOOL =0

***INCLUSION SCORE IS COMPUTED BY DIVIDING WEIGHTED TOTAL BY TOTAL CHILDREN

The Arc's Report Card

on including children with mental retardation in regular education

The Arc

a national organization on mental retardation

*"Inclusion is a right, not a privilege for a select few"**

What is inclusion?

Inclusion means all students with mental retardation:

- are integrated into regular classrooms and activities for both educational and social opportunities;
- receive an individualized education program with supports enabling them to learn in the regular classroom;
- have the opportunity to participate in school social and extracurricular activities with peers without disabilities; and,
- attend schools in their own neighborhoods and do not attend segregated programs anywhere else.

Why is inclusion important to The Arc?

The Arc believes preparation for life in the community best occurs when all students of different backgrounds and abilities learn and socialize together in classrooms and other school settings where all have a chance to achieve and receive instruction designed to develop and enhance successful living within the community (Position Statement on Education, Adopted by Delegate Body of The Arc, 1990).

What is the purpose of this report card?

The Arc wanted to determine the extent to which children with mental retardation were being educated in the regular classroom. We found that states continue to segregate children with mental retardation in separate buildings and classrooms, often outside of their own neighborhoods. Thus, The Arc scored and assigned a *grade* to each state on the progress made in achieving inclusive education for these children.

*(Honorable John F. Gerry, Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, District of New Jersey, in ordering a New Jersey school district to develop an inclusive education plan for an eight year old boy with severe intellectual and communication disabilities, 1992.)

State Ranking on Inclusion and Grade Assigned by The Arc

Rank	State	Grade	Rank	State	Grade
1.	Massachusetts	C	27.	Puerto Rico	F
2.	Vermont	C	28.	Delaware	F
3.	Wyoming	D	29.	Mississippi	F
4.	Idaho	D	30.	Colorado	F
5.	New Hampshire	D	31.	Georgia	F
6.	Arkansas	D	32.	Hawaii	F
7.	Nebraska	D	33.	Kansas	F
8.	Kentucky	D	34.	Virginia	F
9.	North Carolina	F	35.	Arizona	F
10.	Iowa	F	36.	Ohio	F
11.	Maine	F	37.	Pennsylvania	F
12.	Oklahoma	F	38.	Nevada	F
13.	South Dakota	F	39.	Texas	F
14.	Tennessee	F	40.	Missouri	F
15.	Washington	F	41.	Michigan	F
16.	Minnesota	F	42.	Indiana	F
17.	Montana	F	43.	Connecticut	F
18.	Alabama	F	44.	California	F
19.	South Carolina	F	45.	Louisiana	F
20.	Alaska	F	46.	Rhode Island	F
21.	Oregon	F	47.	D.C.	F
22.	North Dakota	F	48.	Florida	F
23.	Utah	F	49.	Illinois	F
24.	West Virginia	F	50.	Maryland	F
25.	New Mexico	F	51.	New York	F
26.	Wisconsin	F	52.	New Jersey	F

Grades for this report card were assigned based on data contained in the Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1992). The report summarizes data from the 1989-90 school year reported by states to the federal government regarding educational environments of children receiving special education and related services. States obtain this information annually from local education agencies.

The report reveals that as a nation we have, to date, failed in this effort as indicated by these disturbing facts about the lack of national commitment to inclusive education:

- Of 561,569 children with mental retardation age 6-21 in our nation's schools, fewer than 7 percent received their education in a regular classroom.
- Only two states educated more than 50 percent of these students in regular classrooms, Massachusetts and Vermont.
- Eight states placed more than 90 percent of students with mental retardation in separate classrooms or separate schools.
- Forty-four states (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) educated less than nine percent of their students with mental retardation in regular classrooms.

Based on the numbers of children with mental retardation served in various educational settings, The Arc developed a weighted inclusion score for each state. From this score, the final grade was assigned.

For a copy of the full report outlining these facts and how the inclusion score was derived, please contact your local or state chapter of The Arc. You can also receive a copy of the report for $2.00, postage paid, by writing:

"INCLUSIVE EDUCATION REPORT"
c/o The Arc
National Headquarters
P.O. Box 300649
Arlington, Texas 76010

The Arc

a national organization on mental retardation

Q&A

REPORT CARD TO THE NATION ON INCLUSION IN EDUCATION OF STUDENTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION

What is inclusion?

Inclusion means all students with mental retardation:

- are integrated into regular classrooms and activities for both educational and social opportunities;
- receive an individualized education program with supports enabling them to learn in the regular classroom;
- have the opportunity to participate in school social and extracurricular activities with same age peers without disabilities; and,
- attend schools in their own neighborhoods and do not attend segregated programs anywhere else.

Why is inclusion important to The Arc?

The Arc believes preparation for life in the community best occurs when students of different backgrounds and abilities learn and socialize together in classrooms and other school settings where all have a chance to achieve and receive instruction designed to develop and enhance successful living within the community (Position Statement on Education, Adopted by Delegate Body of The Arc, 1990).

What is the purpose of this report card?

The Arc wanted to determine the nation's progress in educating children with mental retardation in the regular classroom. For more than 15 years, federal policy (Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act - Public Law 94-142) has required school districts to give priority to placing a child with disabilities in a regular classroom setting with the use of supplementary aids and services before exploring other more restrictive alternatives.

What data did The Arc use to prepare the report card?

The data for this report were obtained from the *Fourteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. The report summarizes data for the 1989-90 school year reported by states to the federal government. States collect the data annually from their local education agencies.

We examined the data for children with mental retardation to assess in which educational environments they were being served. Local school districts reported how many children they serve in six different settings: regular class, resource room, separate class, separate school facility, residential facility and homebound/hospital.

What are some of the key national findings?

Some of our key findings about the educational environments in which children with mental retardation are being served include:

- Fewer than seven percent receive their education in the regular classroom, the most inclusive setting.
- Twenty percent are educated in resource rooms. Some of these students may receive part-time instruction in a regular classroom.
- The most common setting for educating students with mental retardation is in separate classrooms. Sixty-one percent receive most of their education in this setting and typically have little interaction with students without disabilities.
- The most segregating setting is a totally separate school. We combined the percentages of children in separate day and residential facilities and found almost 12 percent of those with mental retardation are in separate schools.
- Overall 73 percent of children with mental retardation are provided their educational programs in segregated settings.

We were interested in how children with mental retardation fare in comparison to other children with disabilities. What we found was that children with mental retardation are almost five times less likely to be educated in a regular classroom, as 31.5 percent of all children with disabilities are placed in regular classroom settings (compared with 6.7 percent of children with mental retardation).

We also found about 5.2 percent of all children with disabilities in separate schools. Over twice as many children with mental retardation, 12 percent, are educated in such settings.

How do states compare in the educational environments they use?

After looking at the national data, we examined how individual states rank in use of these different educational environments. We found great variations across states and present examples of some of the extremes.

<u>In the use of regular classrooms:</u>

- Only two states educate more than 50 percent of students with mental retardation in regular classes: Massachusetts (59%) and Vermont (54%).
- Nine states place fewer than one percent of students with mental retardation in regular classrooms: New York, Georgia, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, New Jersey, Florida, District of Columbia and Mississippi.

<u>In the use of resource rooms:</u>

- Three states have more than 50 percent of their students with mental retardation in resource rooms: Iowa (64%), South Dakota (63%) and Kentucky (55%).
- Six states use it for fewer than five percent: California, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Illinois, New York and Florida.

National Headquarters, 500 E. Border St., S-300, Arlington, Texas 76010, 817/261-6003•817/277-0553 (TDD)

In the use of separate classrooms:

- Only two states serve fewer than 20 percent of students with mental retardation in separate classes: Wyoming (10%) and Massachusetts (18%).
- Three states serve more than 80 percent in separate classes: Ohio (84%), Indiana (83%) and California (81%).

In the use of separate schools:

- Alaska is the only state not placing children in separate schools.
- Seven states serve more than 25 percent of students with mental retardation in separate schools: New Jersey (46%), Maryland (38%), New York (32%), District of Columbia (32%), Nevada (31%), Delaware (28%) and Michigan (28%).

How did The Arc rank and grade states?

In order to compare states on the inclusiveness of the settings in which they educate children with mental retardation, a formula for weighting the educational placements used by schools was devised. The most inclusive setting, the regular class, was assigned a weight of 4; the resource room was assigned a weight of 2; the separate class a weight of 1; and the separate school which is not at all inclusive was assigned a weight of 0.

Using these weights an inclusion score was calculated for each state by multiplying the number of children in each setting by the assigned weight, and then dividing the total weighted score by the total number of children in the state.

State Ranking on Inclusion and Grade Assigned by The Arc

Rank	State	Grade	Rank	State	Grade
1.	Massachusetts	C	27.	Puerto Rico	F
2.	Vermont	C	28.	Delaware	F
3.	Wyoming	D	29.	Mississippi	F
4.	Idaho	D	30.	Colorado	F
5.	New Hampshire	D	31.	Georgia	F
6.	Arkansas	D	32.	Hawaii	F
7.	Nebraska	D	33.	Kansas	F
8.	Kentucky	D	34.	Virginia	F
9.	North Carolina	F	35.	Arizona	F
10.	Iowa	F	36.	Ohio	F
11.	Maine	F	37.	Pennsylvania	F
12.	Oklahoma	F	38.	Nevada	F
13.	South Dakota	F	39.	Texas	F
14.	Tennessee	F	40.	Missouri	F
15.	Washington	F	41.	Michigan	F
16.	Minnesota	F	42.	Indiana	F
17.	Montana	F	43.	Connecticut	F
18.	Alabama	F	44.	California	F
19.	South Carolina	F	45.	Louisiana	F
20.	Alaska	F	46.	Rhode Island	F
21.	Oregon	F	47.	D.C.	F
22.	North Dakota	F	48.	Florida	F
23.	Utah	F	49.	Illinois	F
24.	West Virginia	F	50.	Maryland	F
25.	New Mexico	F	51.	New York	F
26.	Wisconsin	F	52.	New Jersey	F

The table illustrates the results. The grades for each state are based on The Arc's interpretation of inclusion, not a typical curve based on overall performance:

- No state deserves an "A" or "B." Massachusetts and Vermont earn "Cs" for being the only two states with scores above 2.5 and who also place more than half of children with mental retardation in regular classrooms.
- The six states with "D" grades, Wyoming, Idaho, New Hampshire, Arkansas, Nebraska, and Kentucky, all have scores above 1.60 and either place more than 10 percent of students with mental retardation in regular classrooms or make extensive use of resource rooms.
- All other states receive grades of "F" on inclusion because they serve few children in regular classrooms and report high use of separate classrooms and schools.
- Five states are selected as demonstrating an extremely poor record of inclusion for children with mental retardation: New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Illinois and Florida. These five states can be found in both the worst ten list for most use of separate schools and in the worst 10 list for least use of regular classrooms and resource rooms.

What are The Arc's inclusion goals for the nation?

By 1995, The Arc calls for all separate schools to be closed and half of all children with mental retardation placed and taught in regular classes.

By the year 2000, all children with mental retardation should receive their education in regular classrooms.

What can chapters of The Arc do to achieve these inclusion goals?

Chapters can present this report to state legislative and education agency officials, local boards of education and local school administrators and to parent/teacher and other organizations urging them to move toward full inclusion of all students. Chapters can celebrate and acknowledge those schools and professionals who properly accomplish inclusion of children with mental retardation. Chapters can train and assist parents to advocate for inclusive education through revisions in education policy, effective participation in decisions for their own child's placement and in monitoring local schools' practices regarding inclusion.

What other actions are needed for the nation's schools to achieve full inclusion?

The federal government must step up monitoring of states' special education programs and enforce compliance with P.L. 94-142. All federal funding programs for special education should promote inclusion, including preservice and inservice training, research and demonstration and information and technical assistance programs.

State education agencies must monitor and ensure local education agencies are complying with the law by providing training and technical asistance as needed. They must also review existing requirements for licensing education personnel to ensure all are trained to practice their specialty in inclusive settings.

How can I obtain a copy of the full report?

Send $2.00 for "Inclusive Education Report" to:
The Arc, P. O. Box 300649, Arlington, Texas 76010.

November 1992